



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CRITICAL NOTICE.

## KUENEN'S INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

*Vol. II. The Prophetical Literature. 2nd Edition (Leiden, 1889).<sup>1</sup>*

THE appearance of the second part of Professor Kuenen's inquiry into the origin and collection of the Old Testament books in a revised and practically re-written second edition is an event of considerable importance in the history of Biblical criticism. The work was originally issued between the years 1861-1865, before Kuenen had become a convert to the theories of Reuss, George, Vatke, and Graf respecting the chronological order of the component parts of the Pentateuch. The more popular "Religion of Israel," issued in 1869 and 1870, with a series of elaborate articles in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, paved the way for the new edition of the Inquiry, which the progress of Biblical studies and the author's own changed point of view had rendered necessary. With exemplary patience, Kuenen set himself to re-write a long and detailed work, which an interval of twenty years had sufficed to render in large portions unsatisfactory or out of date. His object had been, and still was, to provide students "with a complete exposition of the present condition of criticism, which should thus not merely advance upon the basis of foundations laid long ago, and generally recognised as stable, but in which the entire edifice should be built up before their eyes." How faithfully that object was fulfilled as regards the Hexateuch, English readers already know. Although the investigations into the historical books were published (in one volume with the Hexateuch) in 1886, they have unfortunately not yet been translated into English. Now after a three years' interval there has appeared the second part of the work, containing the Prophetical books. It is to be hoped that an English translation of this volume, which deals with a more interesting portion of Scripture, may before long be undertaken. It would be superfluous to indicate the importance of a right comprehension of the Prophets in the study of all Biblical questions. But we cannot use these writings correctly till we can assign each part of them with tolerable certainty to its own age. Criticism has not been satisfied with a separation of the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah from the first thirty-nine, or of the first eight chapters of Zechariah from the last six. The questions with which we have now to deal are still more delicate; they even include discussions into the authenticity of particular verses in, otherwise genuine chapters, or into the differences between the spoken and the written form of the prophetical work. In the last ten years, Stade's investigations into supposed post-exilic interpretations and editings of pre-exilic authors would, if all

---

<sup>1</sup> The Dutch title is *Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds. Tweede, geheel omgewerkte Uitgave. Tweede Deel. De Profetische Boeken.*

accepted as correct, destroy many a feature hitherto pretty unanimously attributed to the picture of pre-exilic prophecy. In Kuenen's new work these latest criticisms are themselves subjected to a critical test.

The book opens with a short introduction into the general nature and range of Hebrew prophecy, both spoken and written, as well as into the subsidiary means (visions, symbolic actions, &c.) of which it occasionally makes use. Except in so far as these introductory pages contain references to and refutations of König's extraordinary literalism (in his *Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments*, 1882), they are chiefly a summary of what our author has already said in his former more dogmatic work upon the Prophets, which is accessible to English students.

Before passing to the investigation of each prophetic book in its order, Kuenen explains that the prophetic writings and poems "were collected and preserved from destruction by the post-exilic Jews, or more particularly by the scribes of Jerusalem." From this fact follow three important results, which I here transcribe in his own words :—

"1. The collection of prophetic books by no means contains everything which was ever spoken by the prophets of Yahveh and afterwards recorded in writing ; what the scribes, from their point of view, did not recognise as the word of Yahveh, they could not include in the sacred literature of their people. How much they excluded cannot now be ascertained. But it is probable that most prophecies, which would have seemed to them unsuited for a place in the Canon, had already perished before their time.

"2. Just as little as we can be assured of the completeness of the whole collection, so uncertain also is our guarantee for the integrity of each separate prophecy. The possibility exists that prophecies, parts of which were accepted, could not be included either in their entirety or without modification. Between the pre-exilic and post-exilic period there lies a deep gulf, and our study of the historic books has already shown to us that despite, or rather in consequence of, its veneration of the past, Judaism was much concerned to fill up this gulf by the modification of the old records.

"3. The existing collection and classification of the prophecies and their relegation under headings which indicate their author and sometimes also his epoch, must not be blindly followed. The scribes, doubtless, frequently left both classification and headings as they found them, which, in these cases, possess the value of an old authentic tradition, extending even to the age of the original authors themselves ; but the possibility that the scribes have here interfered in one way or another of themselves is always present, and must never be lost sight of."

In accordance with the general plan, these results are further developed and substantiated in the notes in small print, which follow after each short section of the book. It is clear that the second of the three is the formula upon which Stade works, and between him and Kuenen there is a difference not in principle but only in degree. From these three results, three critical rules for the whole inquiry are then elicited. The prophecies must be treated by (1) the historic situation they presuppose, the age in which the writer's point of view, his ideas and expectations are rooted ; (2) the comparison of the prophecies with one other ; (3) their language and style. These are the rules by which investigations into interpolations and reproductive or second-hand prophecies, such as Stade's, must be carried on. Kuenen will not allow that Stade has ever consciously been false to these rules of critical method. "But in our judgment of his critical studies we must consider

with all the greater exactitude whether as a matter of fact he has always remained faithful to this method, or has not here and there fallen into an *à priori* way of arguing, which, from every point of view, merits disapprobation and most especially from his own" (p. 25).

After twenty-seven introductory pages such as these, the writings attributed to each of the fifteen prophets in the Canon are investigated separately. A final section is devoted to Daniel.

The method of the book is to give first a short sketch of the life and times of each prophet, so far as these are known. Then the inquiry passes on to the contents and order of his prophecies, their genuineness, the occasional interpolations, the historic circumstances, the unauthentic prophecies wrongly attributed to the writer with whose genuine productions they are now combined, the history of their collection, etc. Thus, the chapter upon Isaiah contains 10 sections: (1) his life and times; (2 and 3) the genuine prophecies in their order; (4) the prophecy against Moab, 'edited' by Isaiah; (5) the historical chapters, xxxvi.-xxxix.; (6) the unauthentic prophecies in i.-xxxv.; (7, 8, 9,) Chapters xl.-lxvi.; (10) origin of the whole collection. A concise bibliography precedes each chapter. Kuenen is notoriously well read in the English literature of his subject; we miss, however, a reference to Cheyne's article upon Isaiah in the *Encyc. Brit.*, to his *Commentary* upon Jeremiah, and to Kalisch's elaborate study of the book of Jonah.<sup>1</sup>

It is impossible within the limits of a review to give a full *résumé* of an exhaustive work of this kind. I shall confine myself to—(1) the dates and sequence of Isaiah's genuine prophecies; (2) Isaiah xl.-lxvi.; (3) the minor post-exilic interpolations in the pre-exilic prophets; (4) a few other critical results.

I. The order of Isaiah's authentic prophecies according to Kuenen is:—ii.-iv., v. (partly, *i.e.* 1-24), xvii. 1-11, vii., viii.-ix. 6, ix. 7-x. 4, v. 25-30 and re-editing of v. generally, xxiii., xxviii., xx., xxi. 11-17, x. 5-34, xi. 1-9, xiv. 28-32, xxix.-xxxi., xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-xviii. (xxxvii. 22-32), i., xxii. 1-14, 15-25, xix. When chapter vi. was written is obviously uncertain.

Little difference of opinion prevails as to ii.-iv. They fall early in the reign of Ahaz (735?) and before the outbreak of the Syrian War; xvii. must also have just preceded the invasion of Judah. The events recorded in vii. relate to the year 734, the Syrian War. The authenticity of its main contents is maintained; though not written by Isaiah, it was probably the work of a disciple (viii. 2-16). Following an article of Budde's, Kuenen not only omits as glosses 8b and "king of Assyria" in 17 and 20, but also 22a and 16. This last omission is based upon his interpretation of the famous prophecy in v. 14. For Immanuel—"of whom it does not by any means appear that he is of Davidic descent or destined to rule, and who must not therefore be identified with the Davidic Messiah of ix. 5, xi. 1-5—is through his fortunes and training the type of Israel's future and vocation; he grows up in a desolate land, which has become unfitted for agriculture (15a), and through this life of privation he is fashioned into a man after Yahveh's heart." Thus in 15b לְדַעְתּוֹ (against Cheyne, but as the Vulgate and Authorised Version) is taken causally, and 16, which, taking it temporally, gives the words another meaning, becomes a gloss.

viii.-ix. 6 comes somewhat later than vii., but during the Syrian War

<sup>1</sup> In the March number of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Kuenen alludes with regret to the omission of Cheyne's article among the literature on Isaiah.

(734): it was written down when the blow had fallen (viii. 23, 2 Kings xv. 29). As regards v. and ix. 7-x. 4, Kuenen's view is somewhat different from Ewald's and Cheyne's. He holds that ix. 7-x. 4 posit the issue of the Syrian War (ix. 10, where the correctness of the reading יָרָם is of course assumed). The conflicting nature of v. is accounted for upon the hypothesis that v. 1-24 was originally composed about the same time as ii.-iv., while v. 25-30 were added on the same occasion as ix. 7-x. 4, when Judah had already been invaded. xxiii. 1-14 is assigned to the reign of Shalmanezzer IV. (727-723). This is not Cheyne's view, but is now rendered probable by the new reading in Niese's edition of Josephus (*Antiquities* ix. 14 §2), where *πέμψας* is changed into *Σελάμψας* = Salmanezzer. Shortly before the fall of Samaria (722) is placed chapter xxviii. To Sargon's reign (722-705) belong xx., xxi. 11-17, and also, according to Kuenen, x. 5-xi. 9. Our author takes up rather a peculiar attitude towards this last prophecy. For while assigning x. 5-xi. 9 to the reign of Sargon, he strongly controverts the hypothesis of an invasion of Judah and a capture of Jerusalem by Sargon, an hypothesis maintained in England by Sayce and Cheyne, and in Germany by Kleinert and once by Schrader. Though this view accounts satisfactorily for x. 9, I must confess I do not see how such language as x. 11, 28-32, if written during Sargon's reign, can be accounted for unless the Assyrian expedition of 711 (Driver's *Isaiah*, p. 45) or 709 (Cheyne, Introduction, chapter xx.) was directed not only against Ashdod, but also against Judah.

After the death of Sargon, and before the invasion of Sennacherib, come the prophecies xiv. 28-32, and xxix.-xxxii. (after Hezekiah's revolt). It seems somewhat strange that Kuenen should say that xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-xviii., are "nearly contemporaneous" with xxix.-xxxii. For surely they imply that the invader has already reached the soil of Judah (Driver, p. 75-76). Into the complicated questions raised by *Isaiah* xxxvi.-xxxix., I cannot enter. Kuenen's concise account in Part I. of the Inquiry of the corresponding and more original chapters in Kings should be compared. It is pleasant to read there that with Cheyne he accepts the Isianic authorship of xxxvii. 22-32 (against Stade, *Z. A. W.*, 1886, page 179). After Sennacherib's defeat are dated i., xxii. and xix. i. is a *résumé* of *Isaiah*'s preaching against the sins of his people, drawn up by himself and perhaps intended to serve as an introduction to a collection of his prophecies. xxii. 1-14 raises many difficulties. If the invasion of Sargon be denied, Cheyne (*Isaiah* ii., page 185) holds that there is no choice but to follow Cornill (*Z. A. W.* 1884, page 96), who, on the ground of its inconsistently severe tone, expresses a grave doubt of its authenticity. Kuenen, with two German critics as his predecessors, thinks the difficulties may be explained upon the assumption that *Isaiah* looks back upon the Assyrian invasion, the siege of Jerusalem, and the measures of defence then taken by its citizens.<sup>1</sup> He reproaches the inhabitants in that they then showed no confidence in Yahveh, and that now, instead of humbling themselves and showing repentance for their sins, they give themselves up to gaiety and debauch. Therefore they are threatened with death.

To this date, xxii. 15-25, which there is no reason to put before 1-14, seems to raise objections. For its curious prediction is supposed to have been fulfilled (?) by the time of Sennacherib's invasion, when

---

<sup>1</sup> A siege of Jerusalem, or an attack upon it is not mentioned in 2 Kings, and even contradicted by 2 Kings xix. 32, but this is not determinative.

Eljakim is over the house, and Shebna is the scribe (2 Kings xviii. 18). Kuenen argues ingeniously that when officers of state are punished (and more especially in the East) they are not usually given another though lower office as a consolation prize. He is thus led to believe that the author of 2 Kings xviii. is in error, that Shebna was over the house and Eljakim the scribe at the time of the invasion, and that thus the prediction of xxii. 15-25 falls, like 1-14, after the Assyrian monarch's inglorious departure from Judæa. The list of genuine prophecies is then closed by xix., the authenticity of which in its entirety is maintained, the ideas in 16-25 not being inconceivable in Isaiah's mouth, if we imagine that they were written some time after the events of 701, in the prophet's last years. These verses would then form his *Schwänengesang*; as Cheyne has said, we can hardly imagine a nobler or more fitting end.

II. It is unnecessary, at the present time, to follow Kuenen in his exhaustive proof that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. could not have been written either by Isaiah himself or by any writer before the exile. Seeing that Delitzsch, in the new (4th) edition of his commentary, has announced his conversion to an exilic date, it would seem almost superfluous to have once more established so certain a conclusion. But Kuenen gives valid reasons (p. 102) for the course he pursues, and certainly no defender of the Isianic authorship would deny the patience and impartiality with which every possible argument upon the traditional side is weighed in the critical balance. In the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, however, I hope that the unauthenticity of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. may safely be assumed.

Like Cheyne in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Kuenen shows clearly why we have also to abandon the unity of those twenty-seven chapters among themselves. They could not all have been written before the capture of Babylon by Cyrus in 538; many chapters, on the contrary, assume the existence of a restored Jewish community in Palestine. This second division was written in Judæa, just as the first class was written in Babylon (p. 143, with notes 9, 10). These general conclusions are shared by Cheyne, but the two scholars differ as to some of the particular chapters which are to be assigned to either division. Cheyne relegates lvi.-lix., lxiii.-lxvi., to the Palestinian division; Kuenen includes in it also l., li., liv., lv., lx.-lxii. The reasons, *drawn from the subject matter of these chapters*, why they are (probably, p. 138) to be dated after 536 and from Palestine, it will interest the student to read in their entirety.

"In chapter l., we are, as it seems, transferred to other circumstances, and a new circle of thoughts. Israel complains of Yahveh, who has rejected and sold his people; but the misfortunes which have befallen it are the result of its sins; the power of Yahveh remains unlimited (1-3). The Prophet, in the fulfilment of his task, is exposed to abusive treatment, but declares that he will endure unflinchingly, in the assurance that Yahveh will help and justify him. He encourages his spiritual associates (4-11). The struggle which is here alluded to lies outside the great question which was the order of the day before 538 (*i.e.*, the deliverance from Babylon); it would rather seem to have been waged in an organised Jewish community, *i.e.*, after 536.—Chapter li. gives the impression of being a consolatory oration addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; the condition of the town is gloomy; the number of its citizens few; yet they must not despair; their lot shall be as that of Abraham and Sarah, the ancestors of a populous nation. The exiles, whose return is announced in ver. 11, are not the first home-comers, but will increase the existing population, which, according to verses

17-20, had suffered much from various calamities. Before 538, Jerusalem could hardly have been spoken of in such terms.—Chapter liv. also refers to the extension of Jerusalem and the increase of her population. Verses 14-17 allude to foes, who are now already her enemies, and are preparing plans against her which Yahveh will frustrate.

"Chapter lv. ends with the announcement of a glorious journey from the land of captivity to Jerusalem, but what precedes is addressed to an already existing Israelite community, which ought to become conscious of its noble destiny and of its vocation to the nations, and should trust in the fulfilment of God's promises. If the community is not yet in existence, the prophet is guilty of a strange ὑστερον πρότερον; but if verses 12, 13, refer to the return of the whole dispersion expected by pious Jews after 536 (compare Haggai and Zech. i.-viii.), his train of thought is perfectly natural . . . . Chapter lx. describes the future glory of Jerusalem, the return of the moral regeneration of her inhabitants, the service of the nations. There is no sign that of all this the very foundations must still be laid, in other words, that Jerusalem is still wholly unpopulated. Chapter lxi. assumes a partial restoration of Jerusalem: 'They that mourn in Zion' (verse 3) are comforted by the prophet; the captive exiles, whose freedom and release is announced (verse 1), are thus those Israelites who are still dispersed in foreign lands; the 'waste cities,' whose repair is still future (verse 4), are the numerous cities of Judah, which had not been occupied by the small band of returning exiles. Much the same is true of chapter lxii.: the watchers upon Zion's walls (verse 6) look out for the coming of her still scattered sons (verses 10-12); over against her future glorification in the eyes of the heathen is set—not her present utterly forsaken condition, but—her smallness and the reproach thereto attached."

Although these chapters are thus to be regarded as Palestinian, it does not necessarily follow that they were not written, at least in part, by the same hand which composed xl.-xlix., lii. 1-12 (and ? lii. 13-liii., p. 143). Kuenen is less precise as to the date of such passages as lvi. 1-8 than Cheyne. But while we may, if we please, assume that the author of the Babylonian chapters returned to Palestine in 536 with Zerubbabel and Joshua, and might possibly have continued to compose up to about 500, there are both negative and positive reasons why at least some of the Palestinian chapters should have been written in the fifth rather than in the sixth century.

"The Palestinian chapters show great variety of historic background, of disposition and of tone, which is less easily to be explained if they were all written in the short period between 536-500. In that case we should have expected a reference, at least in some passages, to the building of the Temple, and to the disagreement with the Samaritans. The internal quarrels in the community, reflected in some places, seem to fit better in the fifth century than in the early years after the return" (p. 146, n. 11).

Again, while on the one hand the mutual agreements of the twenty-seven chapters are sufficiently accounted for by the fact that they were written comparatively near together and from the same circle of authors, the difference of ideas, style, and language (as well as the difference in contents), between some chapters and others, makes their unity of origin extremely doubtful, if not entirely impossible (p. 145 fin.).

The following characteristics of the Babylonian group are wanting in the Palestinian chapters:—

(1.) The peculiar *reductio ad absurdum* argument against image worship.

(2.) The stress and insistence upon Yahveh's absolute unity.

(3.) The appeal to the fulfilment of former prophecies in proof of Yahveh's foreknowledge.

(4.) The ideal conception of Israel as the servant (עֶבֶד in singular) of Yahveh, and of his mission to the heathen. (עֶבֶד in singular occurs in the Palestinian sections only 1. 4-11, but he is there more than elsewhere identified with the prophet himself, who in verses 4-9 speaks of his own experiences and feelings. Compare the parallel passage lxi. 1-3.)

On the other hand, in the Palestinian chapters, "the servants of Yahveh," who represent an antagonism within the community itself, are frequently mentioned; never in the Babylonian.

The verbal differences which follow (pp. 148, 149), need not be specially quoted, as one can put them together, with the help of Naegelsbach's index, for oneself. (By-the-by, should not this index, which Cheyne has called invaluable, have entitled Naegelsbach's commentary to a place in the Bibliography on page 29?) Thus the conclusion of the whole matter is that "a part of xl.-lxvi., in particular xl.-xlix., lii. 1-12 (lii. 13-liii. ?) was written down by its author in Babylon before 536, and in that year was brought either by himself or by contemporaries of the same spiritual kin to Judæa. Here it was preserved, and became the kernel of a gradually growing collection. The original author may himself have added something, but the largest number of additions came from others, who formed one circle with him, or, in so far as they lived afterwards, kept its traditions in honour, and transmitted them. At a date which cannot be exactly fixed, but was probably not later than the end of the fifth century (for there are no clear traces of a later age), all the prophecies were collected together, and at least, to some extent, arranged (page 136, note 3). The redactor of our present book of Isaiah found chapters xl.-lxvi. in much the same form as we now possess them, and in that condition included them in his book."

III. The arguments by which Stade attempts to invalidate the authenticity of pre-exilic passages where the conversion of "many nations" is foretold, as well as of those in which the uniqueness of Yahveh's creative majesty is dwelt upon, cannot be cited here. Stade is always worth reading, and no one can safely neglect to study his papers on this subject in his *Zeitschrift*. The plan and limits of Kuenen's book unfortunately do not allow him to deal in detail with Stade's theological arguments. He is compelled to merely indicate the reasons when his conclusions differ from those of the Giessen professor.

One of Stade's most interesting essays in his *Zeitschrift* dealt with Micah iv. and v. Cornill and Nowack replied to it, and Stade rejoined. These chapters of Micah include the celebrated prophecy of the conversion of the nations, and the cessation of war, which is also found in Isaiah ii. 2-4. Kuenen's view is that both Isaiah ii. 2-4, and Micah iv. 1-4 (5?) are to be regarded as more or less faithful copies of one pre-exilic original, which has no longer been preserved to us. "Neither its form nor its contents forbid us to believe that it was written by an older contemporary of Isaiah and Micah." The note in small print (note 8, page 40), then shortly deals with Stade's objections as follows:—

"Stade maintains that the prophets of the eighth century have always one or more *particular* nations in view, and that although they mention now and then the homage to be paid to Yahveh by one or more foreign



peoples (Isaiah xviii. 7, xix. 18 fol.), the idea of a conversion of 'many peoples' or of 'all the nations,' is unknown both to them and the pre-exilic prophets generally. But in order to maintain this assertion he has been compelled to withdraw a gradually growing number of pre-exilic texts from the authors among whose prophecies they stand, and to regard them as 'secondary' or interpolated, sometimes moreover upon very weak or even worthless grounds. In this way he has to renounce Isaiah viii. 9, xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-14, xxix. 7 (how then about ver. 8 b?) as well as Jer. iii. 17, 18 (*Z. A. W.*, iii. 14 f., iv. 151-154, 260, n. 1).

"We shall have occasion to refer to some of these suppositions again. But it is already apparent that they over-step the line between criticism and hypercriticism. Moreover, they do not attain their goal. For besides the passages named above, one would also have to omit Jer. xii. 15-17, xvi. 19-21, xxxiii. 9, Zeph. iii. 9 and Isaiah xviii. 3.<sup>1</sup> For is it not very noticeable that the prophet here summons 'all the inhabitants of the world and dwellers on the earth' to give heed to the great work which Yahveh is preparing to do? Is this summons so very far from the prospect opened up in ii. 2-4? We may unhesitatingly allow that that prospect only became general and a part of the popular faith in and after the exile, but this is no valid reason for denying that a single mind could have risen to it already in the eighth century."

Whether Amos, the first of the literary prophets, had attained the conception of Yahveh as the creator and ruler of all things in heaven and upon earth, is clearly a very important question for the history of Old Testament theology. Duhm, Wellhausen and Stade have denied it. Kuenen follows Robertson Smith in maintaining the authenticity of the passages in Amos where these ideas are introduced. He shows that although these verses (iv. 13, v. 8, 9, ix. 5, 6) can be omitted without harm to the logical sequence of the thought, this is not a sufficient argument on the strength of which to reject them. They are as it were ejaculations, and need only a psychological justification. Amos clearly had an open eye for the wonders of nature. The language of the verses is rather favourable to his authorship than otherwise.

"They would only then have to be rejected if such praises of Yahveh as the ruler of nature were entirely wanting in the pre-exilic literature. . . . But in order to assert this we must not only omit Jer. v. 20-22, xxxii. 17-23 (with xxxi. 35-37, which indeed lie already under suspicion), but also, so far as I see, Micah i. 2-4, which passage rests upon a no less exalted conception of Yahveh's power; perhaps also some other texts quoted in *Religion of Israel*, I., p. 41-67. It is true that these doxologies only become frequent in Deutero-Isaiah and in the post-exilic poetry. But it seems to me too venturesome to expel them for that reason utterly out of the older literature" (page 62. note 6).

In these two notes Professor Kuenen deals generally, though cursorily, with two of the reasons for assuming interpolations. But I have already indicated that he by no means attempts to clear even the authentic prophecies from all post-exilic additions. I will here shortly give some of his results:—

(a.) Isaiah viii. 9-10, viii. 23-ix. 6 are authentic (against Stade, *Zeitschrift*, IV. 260, note 1, *Geschichte*, I. 596, note 2, and II. 209), page 45, note 17. Of Isaiah xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-14, the authenticity is also

<sup>1</sup> Some of these passages have indeed been "obelised" by Stade already. For Jer. xii. 15-17 see *Geschichte*, Vol. I., page 676 n.; for xvi. 19-21, xxxiii. 9, *ibid.*, page 646 n., and for Zeph. iii., page 644, note 3.

maintained against Stade (page 61, note 12). But xxiii. 15-18, is a late addition to xxiii. 1-14, influenced by Jer. xxv. 11, xxix. 10, and probably post-exilic (page 49 and note 24.)

(b.) Isaiah xi. 10-xii., in accordance with Stade, and some older critics, are regarded as an exilic expansion of x. 5-34, xi. 1-9 (page 55, and note 7, page 57<sup>1</sup>).

The "secondary" prophecies and passages in Jeremiah, according to Stade, make up a goodly quantity (see his *Geschichte*, vol. I. page 646, note 1, 676, note 1. *Z. A. W.*, iii. 14, iv. 151-154, v. 175, note 1).

According to Kuenen, the interpolated passages in i.-xxiv., xxvi.-xlv. are :—

(a.) ix. 22-25 probably, page 181 and note 11.

(b.) x. 1-16 are in the manner of Isaiah xl.-lxvi., page 180 and notes 8, 9, 10.

(c.) xvi. 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, xvii. 1-18 are fragments, some of which are of doubtful authenticity, page 188 and note 19 (xvi. 14, 15 are probably an early marginal note intended to soften verse 13; xvi. 19-21, on the other hand are guaranteed by iii. 17, xii. 14-17. xvii. 1-4, are certainly pre-exilic, if not by Jeremiah, etc.).

(d.) xvii. 19-27 belong to the period of Ezra (p. 174 and note 16).

(e.) xxx. 10-11, 22-24, xxxi. 35-37, xxxii. 17-23, xxxiii. 2-3, are probably, and xxxiii. 14-26 certainly, later exilic or post-exilic additions (page 204 and notes 20, 22, 23, 25). Of course the whole bulk of the remaining prophecies after these small passages have been removed was not written down as we now possess it by Jeremiah himself. Chapters xxvi., xxxvi., xlv. for instance cannot even be attributed to a contemporary, though their writer is in all essentials to be trusted. xviii.-xx. are also edited, and so too xxviii. and xxix., which are about, but not by, Jeremiah. Their author is, however, trustworthy (page 194 and note 7, and for xxxix.-xlv. page 210 f).

In the minor prophets, the authenticity of the references to Judah, both in Hosea and Amos, is maintained, except in Hosea i. 7 (p. 335, n. 8-10; p. 361, n. 6). Obadiah, and Jeremiah xlix. 7-22, have both excerpted an older prophet, perhaps a contemporary of Isaiah. Obadiah 1-9 are drawn from him; 10-21 are probably post-exilic and of the fifth century. A minute investigation of Micah iv., v., leads to the conclusion that iv. 9, 10, 14, v. 1-8, 9-14 (in a more original form, because of v. 13) are Micah's; while iv. 6-8, 11-13, and modifications in v. 9-14 belong to an exilic or post-exilic redactor. The discussion, though very condensed, is extremely interesting (§ 74, n. 5-9). Exilic are also ii. 12, 13. Chapters v.-vi. 16 belong to the age of Manasseh, while vii. 7-20, in agreement with Wellhausen, is relegated to the exile. As to Habakkuk, Kuenen concurs with Stade that ii. 9-20, is a later post-exilic addition (§76, n. 4-7 and §77, n. 9). Habakkuk iii. is not connected with ii. 9-20 (as Stade thinks, *Z. A. W.*, iv. 154-159), but is none the more the production of Habakkuk. It has been taken over from a collection of songs of probably post-exilic origin (p. 389). In Zephaniah, the whole of ii. including v. 1-3, 11, is not to be doubted, but iii. 14-20 is clearly not earlier than ii. Isaiah, and probably dates from the first years of the Second Temple. The conclusions as to Zech. ix.-xiv. will be summed up below.

IV. Space is wanting to give an analysis of Kuenen's chapters

<sup>1</sup> As to xi. 1-9 Stade's suspicions have gradually grown. In *Zeitschrift* III. 16, xi. 1-9 are regarded as authentic; in *Geschichte*, Vol. I., page 586n, only v. 1-4 or 5; in *Geschichte*, Vol. II., page 210, not even these.

on Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It should, however, be noted that he maintains the general authenticity of Jeremiah's prophecies against the heathen nations, although, of course, not that against Babylon (xxv., xlv. xlix., not l. li.). There is an intimation that Schwally's essay, which appeared too late to be considered in the *Inquiry*, will be replied to in another place. It is quite like the tried patience of our author that after he had just finished his analysis of these difficult and rather tedious chapters he should be willing, and even anxious, to begin a renewed study of the whole subject. If he does so, it is greatly to be hoped that the theological questions will be fully discussed. Schwally is clearly a disciple of Stade. No review of Stade's *Geschichte* has appeared in the *Tijdschrift*, and we are thus not yet fully aware of the impression made upon the great Dutch scholar's mind by Stade's more "advanced" views. That Kuenen is not prepared to follow Stade the whole way we have seen from his views upon Isaiah ii., and the suggested interpolations in Amos. It is clear that he lays greater stress upon the development between Isaiah and Jeremiah, and on the range of religious thought already attained at the end of the seventh century, than either Wellhausen or Stade. This we might infer from his *Religion of Israel*, and the treatment of Isaiah xxxii. and xxxiii. in the new edition of the *Inquiry* shows that the views expressed in 1870 are probably to a great extent retained. For although Kuenen is convinced by Stade's most able essay upon these chapters that they are not from Isaiah's hand (so that they will, in all probability, have to be added to the pretty considerable bulk of non-Isianic interpolations in the first thirty-five chapters of his book), he is, nevertheless, not inclined to relegate them to the growing mass of the post-exilic literature. He thinks they were written either under Josiah at the time of the Scythian invasion, or somewhat later (but before 586) with an eye to the Chaldeans (p. 87, n. 6). The doctrine of individual retribution, and that of the Divine Spirit as the needed cause of moral regeneration, must then be included among pre-exilic phases of religious thought.<sup>1</sup>

Whereas the tendency of advancing criticism has thus been to ascribe dates to writings or portions of writings later than those which tradition has attributed to them, there is one notable instance in the prophets in which criticism, up to within a short time ago, was pretty generally pursuing the opposite path. "Among the conclusions of Old Testament criticism, none has probably found so wide a circulation as the opinion that chapters ix.-xiv. of Zechariah were not composed by the contemporary and coadjutor of Zerubbabel and Joshua but are the work of one or two pre-exilic prophets."<sup>2</sup> In these chapters the tables were turned.

The apologists, who of course insisted upon the unity of the whole book of Zechariah, argued for the post-exilic, the critics for the pre-exilic date. Stade (though not without cursory predecessors, as he himself points out, one of whom was Geiger) was the first to subject these chapters to an elaborate examination, with the object of proving that they are not only entirely post-exilic, but also considerably later than Zechariah, Zerubbabel's contemporary, belonging in fact to the Grecian period, and that they were written by a single author. Kuenen, after a concise survey of the evidence (page 408-424), becomes partly, though only partly, a convert to Stade's view. The unity

<sup>1</sup> We shall learn more of Kuenen's present views when the second edition of the third part of the *Inquiry* is issued, and we see whether he still adheres to the pre-exilic date of Proverbs.

<sup>2</sup> The opening words of Stade's essay in the *Z. A. W.*, 1881.

of authorship he rejects; chapters xii.-xiv. are relegated in their entirety to the Second Temple, but the proximate date is fixed at 400. "There are no definite reasons to go down lower into the Grecian period" (page 417 and *n* 8). In ix.-xi., the question is far more intricate; for while there are passages which are certainly earlier than the fall of Samaria, there are others which imply its capture. The connection of the thought is very broken throughout. It is impossible to account satisfactorily for these differences upon the supposition that the post-exilic writer has every now and then purposely clothed his ideas in archaic forms. We are driven to the hypothesis that in ix.-xi. (together with xiii. 7-9, which following Ewald is rightly connected with them), "genuine pre-exilic fragments have been preserved for us, dating mostly from the eighth century B.C., strung together, not unfrequently, in an awkward manner, by a post-exilic redactor, and enriched with additions from his own hand." (page 411.)

Thus ix. 1-8 belongs to the eighth century, with the exception, perhaps, of verse 6 (and 7?), if allusion is there made to the mixed population of Ashdod in the fifth century (Neh. xiii. 23 f.). ix. 10, 13 point to a still existing kingdom of Israel. So do xi. 4-17, xiii. 7-10, which probably allude to the occurrences after 746 (*i.e.*, after Jeroboam the Second's death). ix. 9, 10 is more like Isaiah (ix. 5, xi. 1) and Micah (v. 1-5) than post-exilic writers; ix. 11, 12, on the other hand, appears to allude to a more than partial captivity of Ephraim. (Verse 13, if the text be correct, has been worked over by a very late redactor). As to chapter x., verses 10-12 may be compared with Hosea vii. 11, ix. 13, xi. 11, xii. 2 (where Egypt and Assyria are also joined together) v. 2, with its mention of teraphim and diviners, would be inapposite after the exile. v. 5-9 must be later than the fall of Samaria (but not necessarily post-exilic). If these conclusions, extracted from the notes 3-11 in § 81, are correct, the additions of the post-exilic redactor must be confined to very narrow limits (ix. 6, 7?, 13?, 14-17?, xi. 1-3?). Kuenen does not give any list himself of these additions, and only speaks of the post-exilic date of ix. 6, 7? and 13 in its present form, if the text be sound. It is the perplexing arrangement of the fragments which best proves that they have passed through a redactor's hands.<sup>1</sup>

A review of a work constructed upon the plan of Kuenen's *Inquiry* is almost bound to prove unsatisfactory reading. It will, however, have served a good purpose if it induce those students who can, to read the book at once, and those who cannot, to learn its language.<sup>2</sup> For while it would be impertinent on my part to sit in judgment upon its merits, I may at least quote the verdict of Professor Cheyne, which, given to the first edition, applies with greater force to the second; it is "a book unsurpassed among introductions to the Old Testament for completeness, accuracy, and sobriety of judgment."

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

<sup>1</sup> Kuenen's conclusions respecting Zech. ix.-xiv. are thus very similar to Prof. Cheyne's in *JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, Vol. I., page 82, only that the latter is inclined to accept the unity of authorship of ix.-xi. (as regards its post-exilic amplifications) and xii.-xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Wer heutzutage etwas tiefer in die alttestamentlichen Studien eindringen will, muss schon um Kuenen's willen das Holländische selber lesen lernen. Kamphausen in his *Review of Stade, Renan and Kittel. Studien und Kritiken*, 1889, page 186.